DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 082 349 EA 005 465

AUTHOR	Hart, Jerry Lee
TITLE	Evaluative Economics: A Process To Compensate Teachers Based on Evaluation of Student Accomplishment of Instructional Objectives.
INSTITUTION	Educational Service Bureau, Inc., Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	73
NOTE	29p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Educational Service Bureau, Inc., 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006 ($5.95)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; Administrator Guides; *Collective Negotiation; Course Objectives; *Educational Accountability; Educational Economics; Motivation Techniques; *Performance Contracts; Productivity; *Teacher Motivation; Teacher Responsibility; *Teacher Salaries
IDENTIFIERS	Efficiency (Education); *Student Productivity

ABSTRACT

This document suggests a management plan for replacing fixed salary schedules for teachers with a pay structure based on student productivity. The plan is more a conceptual process of attacking the problem, rather than the resolved finality of a specific plan. The instructional objectives, the accomplishment evaluation, and the subsequent amount of compensation earned in accordance with this idea, are all basically determined by the professional staff itself as part of the evolutionary development of the suggested method. The author begins by outlining the historical unwillingness of public school employers and employees to attempt the correlation of compensation factors with employee production. He then considers factors that have changed in the 1970's to make a compensation plan based on productivity more attractive. The balance of the presentation is given over to a discussion of the essential premises on which the plan is based, an overview of the plan, and a procedural implementation of a plan from the time it is first presented to the board to the time when objectives are created and evaluated. The document concludes with a discussion of the management control of such a plan. (Author/DN)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 082349

EVALUATIVE ECONOMICS

A PROCESS TO COMPENSATE TEACHERS BASED ON EVALUATION OF STUDENT ACCOMPLISHMENT OF INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES

By

Dr. Jerry Lee Hart

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Educational Service Bureau
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

EDUCATIONAL SERVICE BUREAU, INC.
1835 K Street, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20006

EA 005 465

First Printing ..... February 1973

Second Printing ..... March 1973

Third Printing ..... April 1973

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Educational Service Bureau

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

Copyright 1973 by Educational Service Bureau, Inc. Price for individual copies, $5.95. No part may be reproduced without the written consent of the publisher. Copies may be ordered from Educational Service Bureau, Inc., 1835 K Street, N. W., Washington, D. C. 20006.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	HISTORY - CLIMATE FOR CHANGE	3
II.	ESSENTIAL PREMISES	9
III.	OVERVIEW	13
IV.	PARTICIPATORY INVOLVEMENT AND PROCEDURAL IMPLEMENTATION	17
V.	MANAGEMENT CONTROL	27

Chapter I

HISTORY - CLIMATE FOR CHANGE

Collective bargaining between public school employers and employees historically has evinced a general unwillingness to attempt to correlate compensation factors and employee production. A rational basis for employee compensation in education thus has been almost nonexistent in the United States to date.

For several years following the most commonly accepted start of the teacher union movement in this country - 1965 - there was a rather standard approach to protecting a program called "merit pay". Management sought to maintain existing programs by getting the unions and those employees directly involved to simply rubber stamp and thereby endorse ongoing designs then in effect. The result was disastrous for several reasons.

First, the representative of employee units in those days was a young, militant, outspoken acti-

vist who sought changes in anything and everything. His most pursued enemy was the status quo, judged to be the unilateral creation of management. Perhaps equally significant, however, was the all too often beneficiary of merit pay programs - the veteran teacher. It did not appear to the young revolutionist that merit pay programs were more than mere bonus schemes for old-timers who were rewarded for perseverance on the job.

Unions quickly found the way to roadblock this pay incentive. By merely failing to agree to its dimensions following introduction at the bargaining table, the union leadership froze it. It could not legitimately be implemented. Management, having introduced it into a decision-making forum, had ethically and in some states legally given up the right to unilateral implementation. School boards were to learn quickly that though management may gain tactical strength in taking some of its own proposals to the negotiations battleground, such action is an erosion of school board power by expanding the decision-making involvement.

Then, just as the 1960's were drawing to a close, management, still trying to preserve a final encore for merit pay, elected to keep it out of negotiations and hope for subsequent unilateral implementation based on a continuance of past practice. Again the result was failure. In states with mandated bargaining statutes the attempt was an erroneous effort to circumvent economic considerations at the bargaining table, as required by law. And equally distasteful for the advocates of such programs was an assertion in the nonstatute states that teachers were not involved in the creation and implementation of such a sensitive program.

CHANGED CLIMATE

In the early seventies, conditions relating to the question of services rendered for payment tendered in public education are markedly different.

First, the public, still the most influential yet nondefinable lobbying pressure in the United States, is literally crying out for "accountability". It asked such probing questions as: What do I get for my dollar? How do I know I'm not being overcharged? Does any increase in expenditures assure an increase in quality education?

Second, all elements have come to admit (though candidly all previously recognized) that not all teachers are good teachers. Further, not all teachers were deserving of all the benefits so sought by union leadership. In essence, the negative effect of poor teaching on the potential success of progressive gain for all teachers had finally been acknowledged from within the teacher movement.

Third, we must cite the present conditions of the job market. The law of supply and demand, currently favoring boards of education, gives an opportunity to upgrade the teaching profession in a discerning and discriminating manner with the most competently qualified and/or experienced personnel available.

Fourth, attitudes about definitive measurement have changed. No longer will the public accept without question the primacy of certain intangible elements which defy specificity in any human-human endeavor. Pragmatic analysis on objective dimensions has become a common expectation in society. State legislators, congressmen and even the President of the United States are cri-

tiqued with scorecard precision for actions and decisions undertaken.

Fifth is the public's attitude that a limit in revenue for educational expenditures has been reached. "Reorder your priorities" or "eliminate your programs" are philosophies seldom advocated before 1970. Today many see only the plausibility of recutting the budgetary pie, not increasing it, or at least not expanding it appreciably.

Finally, employee leadership has changed in character and attitude in many places in this country. Daily it appears to be more responsive to, if not representative of, the constituency it represents. It is indeed refreshing to sense a broader base of creative input and not still be forced to limit reflective consideration of any management posture to the self-serving interests of a select few.

All of the above speaks to a condition, a climate in which leadership for educational change can emanate from management efforts.

For too long we have searched for utopia in an existing program from another school district. Educators flock to countless meetings, clinics, seminars and conventions, searching for ideas that have already been developed into working designs and currently implemented. While steadfastly defending the concept of local autonomy of the individual district, educational leaders have nonetheless extensively practiced the exercise of transferring the on-going programs of another locale to their own constituency with but necessary minor modification. Not always has this been an unwise practice. Indeed, such transference has been beneficial to countless many for numerous years. But

we cannot expect constantly and forever to merely lift the programs which others have developed because we are either incapable of creating them, or are too lazy, or because we believe everything is applicable to our particular school environment.

There are common elements of most successful programs in any field of endeavor, perhaps even common components. One must understand more than basics. Original intent and evolutionary development, which transforms a desire to a thought to a plan to a molding mechanism and subsequently to a finished product, is indicative of strength seldom exhibited in public education. Some would rationalize we are too complex an institution to entertain and complete a worthwhile yet monumental objective without serious compromise. Others venture that the cross currents of vested interests will erode any effort to avoid a mediocre conclusion on any worthwhile objective. Still others merely fault the dissolving of unilaterally concentrated decision-making by a public board as a condition which inhibits at best and prevents at worst the successful accomplishment of a worthwhile goal.

Such arguments serve only as excuses for the failure to produce. This publication will assume no such impediments to success. Rather, it is based on a concept, not a preconceived plan - a process of development, not a packaged program already in existence. Its approach is through the negotiations channel, guaranteeing contestability yet culminating in commitment of both parties. Its premise is that teachers should be compensated for what they produce. Its anatomy is intregal, though separable in stages and therefore easily implementable. Its composite name is "Evaluative Economics".

Chapter II

ESSENTIAL PREMISES

"Evaluative Economics" is more a conceptual yet definitive process of attacking a problem, rather than the resolved finality of a specific plan. Even after one were to understand its evolutionary, step-by-step development, no prognostication would be possible in affixing exact compensatory statistics, nor would it be conceivable to highlight exactly acceptable levels of performance. Such information is determined only by those who participate in the developmental exercise, and is ascertainable only as the process itself evolves.

Two premises, however, lay the groundwork for facilitating an approach to the problem in this manner. The first would relate to a key element inherent in nearly every bargaining law thus far enacted. There is no requirement that the parties must reach agreement in the execution of the bargaining activity. For years management has greatly misunderstood the value of this reality. While fearing to entertain serious discussions on sensitive

issues, board representatives consistently faulted the legislature's requirements and professed that no flexibility or alternatives remained which would facilitate management's opportunity to still run the school operation.

Nothing could be further from the truth. School management must accept responsibility for massive erosion of what it felt to be prerogatives because it gave those rights away by choice or ineptness of execution. Concession and compromise by board representatives is at the very core of mutual decision-making in negotiations. Semantically speaking, teachers agree to things; pragmatically, this agreement represents little more than a willingness to retreat from further pressure on a given subject matter area for the remainder of this negotiating season.

In essence, no law is that devastating; it takes two to agree and having done that, regardless of the tactics or pressure used, management must accept the consequences of its action, not point the finger of accusation.

Now, however, one must recognize the value in this. Unions need that agreement in the bargaining process. At least a limited number of areas are most certainly essential to foster the stability and, in most cases, symbolic reputation of the union thrust.

Though, in failing to reach any accord whatsoever, the plight facing the union and management would indeed be different, it must be recognized that each does face in its own sphere a difficult problem. Too often management personnel envisions where the union leadership is headed - en-

croachment in policy decision-making - and fails to recognize that the rank and file, representing the majority of the constituency, desires only economic gain and improved working conditions as the elements of success.

UNION WEAKNESSES

In reality, and as a last resort, but a requirement in any bargaining endeavor, the union must achieve economic gain. No union can exist, certainly not for long, without an instrumental role in improving the employees' economic condition on a yearly basis. For too long management has failed to realize the strength in this concept and the opportunity it presents in balancing the scales of negotiations leverage. School boards, looking introspectively have failed to probe the problems and vulnerable concerns of the enemy. Certainly the knowledge that union representatives must acquire economic gain in every contract negotiated has been the untapped, yet vulnerable flaw in the history of educational negotiations. Most definitely, such point of vulnerability is at the very center of the Evaluative Economics concept.

CONCEPT, NOT DOLLARS

A second premise in the developmental scheme is the acknowledgement that economics per se is a means to an end and not the end itself. Dollar designations, pay scales, or fringe programs represent an activity, service, or product in execution; the fiscal assignments in each instance is but a value assessment consistent with a materialistic expression dictated by the fiscal phraseology our society demands. In education, a salary schedule is perhaps more accurately an expression of decision-making regarding the experience and/or training of one who may wish to be applied to the environment upon which one may wish to be judged. There is no guarantee that any correlation exists between he who serves in such environment and those who receive the attention of that service.

For a comprehensive understanding of what is being attempted in this document, one must constantly keep in mind these two premises. They are interwoven throughout the execution of and essential to the success of Evaluative Economics. Repeating more succinctly, management must:

1) Use the knowledge of the union necessity to make economic gain in bargaining by utilizing leverage in the negotiations process, and

2) Concentrate on the evolutionary development by the participants upon objectives, standards, and other key elements of the process, recognizing any statistical specificity as to number, level, amount, or degree as only symbolic terminology and incidental to the procedure being underscored.

Chapter III

OVERVIEW

Evaluative Economics is a method of compensating certificated staff based upon the accomplishment of student objectives. The objectives themselves, evaluation of accomplishment, and subsequent amount of compensation earned in accordance with this idea, are all basically determined by the professional staff itself as part of the evolutionary development of the method or process.

There is a large assurance of management control at all stages, though many dimensions are not definitively developed at the outset. The key to insuring commitment and implementation is management's incorporating the entire language enunciating procedures and establishing responsible entities to oversee the execution of all provisions contained in such language. Paramount to the success of the entire concept is that management will not add one additional dollar to any present compensation formula or salary schedule in public edu-

cation unless and until union representatives agree to incorporate all the basic elements inherent in an Evaluative Economics board proposal into a Master Agreement.

Thereafter, staff devises instructional objectives, a term used herein to mean performance, behavioral, or any other so termed meaningful standard signifying relevant student growth. It is required to provide data and/or test the degree of objective accomplishment which in turn reflects an amount of earned compensation.

Failure of timely execution according to required time deadlines of specified activity as stipulated in the language of the Master Agreement will default designated funds available as compensation for this undertaking and revert those funds to the board, which, according to the mandate of the context language, can then unilaterally determine appropriate objectives and pay the same teachers under the same process, or hire additional personnel (specialists) who will be required to execute the provisions and intent of the concept as originally incorporated.

A lessening of certificated teacher involvement by those who discount or ignore definitive measures of accountability and a corresponding increased reduction of compensation, would, in just a few years, transform any district staff exclusively to personnel willing and capable of functioning in, and being compensated according to, a productivity philosophy.

The school board would set aside a limited amount of its funds for application to this endeavor the first year, but would increase it yearly as it

decreased a corresponding amount designated for traditional compensatory methods of paying teachers.

Exceptions, right of appeal, and various checks and balances all aimed at protecting due process and justice inherent whenever one deals with the complexities of both the human and learning element, would be expected to be appropriately a part of Evaluative Economics.

Chapter IV

PARTICIPATORY INVOLVEMENT AND PROCEDURAL IMPLEMENTATION

The first step in the development of Evaluative Economics is that management understands the overall long-range plan as well as the elements and timely enactment of the various phases.

In creating a board proposal of this dimension, it would be recommended that members be apprised of the potentially difficult ramifications of such an undertaking. One must honestly assert that although the likelihood of gain is significant - increased accountability, definitive measurement, improved education - there exists an equally sobering possibility that it may take a long, devastating fight to assure the inclusion of such a program in the school district.

Some boards are ready to fight for a worthwhile project. However, on the whole, most boards talk of vision and commitment in the cool

of a winter season, yet find the heat of pressure in late summer that allows little time remaining to resolve the publicly highlighted question of whether the staff will be present at the opening bell of the new school year.

Once past the hurdle of commitment, the plan of Evaluative Economics is unfurled and ready to be put into effect.

The proposal is drafted by management. Not many such proposals are drafted for board submittal during this particular negotiating season. The emphasis is focused on this rather complex and sensitive area. As to the relative merit of other board proposals, one must be quick to note that a school board can easily over-extend itself by submitting initial demands. Most all such proposals are trivia, or perhaps worse, are things management could pronounce unilaterally without subjecting them to a mutual decision-making process.

TASK FORCE

This specific proposal must call for various mechanisms and procedures to guarantee the success of the endeavor. It will call for a TASK FORCE, whose primary responsibility will be, in essence, overseer of the agreed-upon proposal itself, assuring that all actions and responsibility occur as ordered. It is the first of two functional committees which are essential to this concept.

In the proposal, management must detail the membership of such TASK FORCE. Strong arguments exist that it be composed of board members or agents, key administrators or their representatives, and teachers. Each could name approximately one-third of the membership. Board members earn their right because the statutes

charge them with grave responsibility for directing a district. On the other hand, administrators must supervise instructional programs and as practitioners need to evaluate the necessary and required elements thereunder. Certainly teachers would be a vital part of such a steering group - both as educators concerned with the upgrading of the teacher-learner endeavor and as employees rightfully concerned about their own economically related benefits.

In the reality of compromise, however, the membership is likely to reflect a 50% concept wherein management names half and so does the union representation. Where this ideology prevails, management through persistence may usually name the chairman of such a group. This would allow a degree of initial influence over such factors as time of meetings held and agenda contents.

The scope of the TASK FORCE is restrictively specific. Its authority to enforce the provisions of the included article, however, would be almost limitless. The logic for concentration of such powerful administrative overtones would be based on two considerations.

First, management does not have to agree to any final enactments across a bargaining table. In so doing it acknowledges what it desires or perhaps as prevails in most cases, what it can live with for an up-coming period of time. If it cannot support aspects of a resolution, management should not agree with it in the first place. Having done so the commitment of execution should rightfully fall on all parties which agreed to the provision.

And in such rationale as the above one finds the second consideration for enhancing enforcement strength into the realm of the TASK FORCE. The commitment of execution is also an expression of the union forces. Specific language contained therein can compel both sides to operate procedurally as designated. Failure of strict adherence by the union may, depending upon the actions or inactions, result in deferral to the board for unilateral decision-making, withholding of pay, or conceivably the invalidation of the entire Master Agreement covering all issues between the parties. Naturally this depends on the punitive stipulations incorporated in language of the resolved article itself. Certainly in a state with a bargaining statute, such commitment is enforceable under the banner of compulsion and one could seek relief from the judicial system in guaranteeing implementation. This is an enormous improvement over the meaningless present day offering by union representatives to incorporate a reference to a "code of ethics" which they write, have the power to amend, process alleged violations thereunder, and have full control of punitive aspects, if any.

An important inclusion in any proposal encompassing a committee-like creation would be a definitive timetable. It would be necessary to assure that membership to the TASK FORCE is named and it become operative, as well as commitment dates for the establishment of instructional objectives and subsequently the reporting of data and, in effect, identifying of the level or degree of accomplishment thereunder. Since a portion of an employee's income is dependent upon the degree to which he accomplished the instructional objectives, it is necessary to receive that information to effect payment to a certificated employee. Any breakdown in the precise enactments of events and/or deadlines under such a plan will

cause a correspondingly adverse reaction to all subsequent expectations involved.

In administration of such a concept as Evaluative Economics the leverage remains, of course, with the actual money allocated to the program. This designation, unlike most of the meaningless merit pay plans of the past, should be expended only upon strict adherence to all the provisions contained within the agreed-upon article.

Violation of union requirements thereunder would by the nature of the language defer those decisions unilaterally but now legally through elimination of the requirement for union action, to the board. A new period of time necessary for the board and/or its representative to do the job which others failed to do, would require a specific citation in the article language itself and a corresponding reference to release, again legally, the moneys protected to be used in other areas.

Accountability contains the important element of timeliness. Education cannot afford months and, in some cases, years of delay in completing a project, such as in construction or defense industries. Kids grow up and though there will always be another class of youngsters next year, we ignore that delays in upgrading the quality of educational process is a disservice approaching inexcusable proportions for the students of yesteryear.

FUNDING

Certainly the area of funding and released time are important to this entire concept. It is not likely, at least in the initial year, that the TASK FORCE will need either. Its responsibility as enforcer of the provisions of the article in the Master Agreement, and coordinator of necessary require-

ments thereunder, is such that a limited time involvement would suffice.

Such, however, would not be the case with staff in the selected subject matter areas. The individuals would need time appropriate to study and, in essence, understand the world of instructional objectives. Each faculty member will be required to assume a central role in the performance of two dimensions, heretofore undoubtedly strange in most aspects to the certificated teacher.

CREATE OBJECTIVES

The first would relate to the creation of objectives. These would encompass both those related generally to the subject matter area which may apply to several, and perhaps in some cases, all students under the teacher's direction.

These would be the "common", perhaps departmental objectives, formulated through cooperation of colleagues, and in conjunction with a supervisor or department chairman.

In addition to these, however, there would be the essential personalized objectives for each child and the capability of diagnosing the student, including all supportive records and experiences, and corresponding drafting of meaningful yet measurable instructional objectives. This is an art few teachers will comprehend, much less be capable of performing. The fear of such a monumental undertaking is usually enough to dissuade one from participating. The related economics will not find favor with the traditional union leadership. This is why it must be locked into a Master Agreement. The released time for the first of these two new dimensions for teachers will appropriately occur before meeting the students. In the initial year of

such undertaking, it would occur in a summer workshop or training seminar. Since most teachers would not be working in any capacity with the school during this time, it is likely that compensation for utilization of their time will represent the first of three major components of expenditure in regard to Evaluative Economics.

Once the traditional school year begins, teachers could then formulate instructional objectives for each student subject to approval by the department chairmen, but within a required time frame mandating submittal to the TASK FORCE as stipulated by the Master Agreement. Failure to meet the submittal deadline for such objectives would put into effect a provision in the article authorizing the board to then legally do it unilaterally and releasing the funds for payment under that program. It would seem consistent that these funds would now be directed to specialized personnel who would undertake the job to do what teachers, for whatever reason, had failed to do.

EVALUATE OBJECTIVES

The second major area of teacher concern, and for which considerable training is necessary, would be in the area of evaluating objective-accomplishment. This would involve testing the gathering and interpretation of data and other essential elements of the final stages. One would suspect that "inservice days," a widespread practice throughout the United States of teachers seeking professional growth experiences with colleagues during the absence of students, might be used to properly orient and prepare staff for the necessary applications related to this phase of the undertaking. Criticism is not uncommon in education wherein one is the assessor of his own work or enactments. However, there is a safeguard against where bias is suspect, which shall be discussed in Part V of this document.

Specific language incorporated in the Master Agreement would stipulate both the selected subject matter areas to initiate the pilot year of this project, as well as the committee within that area or department responsible as a steering mechaniam for assuring that the TASK FORCE is presented in a timely fashion with its requirements.

Though a department chairman may head such committee, it would be logical to assign all teachers within the department to the committee. Any failure of the committee thereafter to meet the timely execution of its responsibilities would likely deprive the members thereof of benefits, which with a mandated chain reaction system was obviously their fault originally. However the committee chose to develop "common" objectives would be left to each department. Needless to debate, each teacher would have to develop instructional objectives for his own students.

Two other major components of expenditure are incorporated in Evaluative Economics. Certainly the need for expert assistance to steer in a cooperative manner a district into and through the development of such a program is an economically based consideration.

This would undoubtedly require a major Project Director who understood each element of the process, its correlation to all others, the corresponding timetable, and the various mechanisms available as well as personnel dynamics involved to accomplish the end result. In addition, various specialists in the area of writing and evaluating instructional objectives would be required. All this professional assistance by expert consultants would represent the second major expenditure component.

It will take several years, perhaps as many as four, to transform an educational institution from a compensatory philosophy based on past considerations only, such as training and experience, as evidenced in all index, columnar-type salary schedules, to a contemporary philosophy of payment for productivity only.

The necessary time lapse is due to several factors. Executionally, no involved party can be expected to exhibit a perfected role. Accordingly, preliminary flaws will affect only a limited segment of the operation in the pilot stages. In addition, the unknown variables of whether staff can ultimately draft appropriate objectives and/or successfully accomplish any goal thereunder is an intangible which sobers the desire for haste. And realistically, even unions will accept only a moderate degree of experimentation into such areas that redefine historical concepts of "equal pay for equal work" now demanded by the public outcry for definitive accountability.

Unions can accept no less in the infant stages of such an undertaking than a guaranteed base pay with a possibility that an added remuneration tending toward some pre-established maximum figure based upon 100% accomplishment if all objectives were attained. The lessening of this figure, when it is based primarily on objectives pre-set and subsequently evaluated by the respective teacher, yet representing only a fraction of the individual's total income anticipated for a year, is not a condition which defies the possibility of mutual acceptance between management and union. This amount of money, namely that portion of an individual's anticipated yearly income which would not be guaranteed, but would be dependent upon the degree of success a teacher has in attaining the objectives, would represent the third major

expenditure component inherent in this process. In reality it is the money set aside to pay certificated staff for successful accomplishment. In practice, it would be applied on an individual teacher concept, not a composite departmental approach. Any teacher, participating hereunder, would ignore any differentiation between "common" and individual objectives for a given student. By adding the percentage of accomplishment regarding all objectives for each student with all students and simply extracting a "mean" for the group, the teacher ascertains the percentage of compensatory eligibility under this plan. This amount in potential will represent whatever the parties had previously agreed and incorporated into the Master Agreement language. It may represent, during pilot stages of this process, as little as 10% or as much as 25% of the maximum attainable income for a teacher in a particular year.

Eventually, as the process evolves, any internal flaws are corrected, and district money allocations and cycles are appropriately incorporated, it would be the intent to expand the dimension of Evaluative Economics in two economic directions: (1) expansion to all areas served by certificated personnel, and (2) enlarging the percentage of one's income to reflect evaluative productivity to an ultimate goal of reflecting 100% of a person's compensation. Thus a district may then discard the index or structured salary schedules.

Chapter V

MANAGEMENT CONTROL

Educational management has been critical of the basic form of teacher salary schedules for many years. However, the alternatives to such schedules have been few and offer management little assurance that any substitute will be better in equity for all concerned than what now exists.

In addition, management has faced perhaps an even more difficult problem, namely how to effect a transfer from one compensatory philosophy to another. Traditionally the approach was to get everyone involved, and assuming a plan could be devised and agreed upon, it could then be incorporated into the system. The hidden destructive variable in this theory has been the advent of the teacher union movement, which highlights job security, standardized pay, and an attitude that all evaluation is subjective and therefore impossible.

If, therefore, as a result of involvement by everyone, a plan was cultivated, its future was pre-

dictably assured. If meritoriously discerning, it was blocked at the bargaining table, and board representatives would eventually concede with noncontingent economic offerings anyway. If the plan was nebulous, union leaders would utilize some aspects of it and pronounce the willingness to effectuate compromise bargaining.

In Evaluative Economics, no plan is predetermined. Granted, the procedure guaranteeing execution of the process which will assure evolution and implementation of the efforts to instill accountability will either be performed or the ramifications relevant thereto put into effect.

At the bargaining table then, one finds the first of three major management control factors in this concept. Either union representatives incorporate all key elements of this proposal into a Master Agreement, or the board will refuse to add any moneys whatsoever to existing compensation methods. Naturally, this takes a dedicated, if not unified, public board, and one which is willing to exert leadership in forging a direction into qualitative improvement of any system, yet with difficult pressures, perhaps not yet evidenced elsewhere in this country.

There are controls in two other vital areas of concern - fiscal and educational.

First, any moneys necessary for the funding of this concept would be deducted during the bargaining process from the moneys the board had available for traditional salary increases. Necessary considerations and corresponding amounts should be established as discussed in Chapter IV of this document. Such approach would insure fiscal in-

tegrity by not exceeding budgetary allocations based on expected in-district activity.

Educational integrity would at first show up in three arenas. The original instructional objectives set for each child must be approved by the immediate supervisor or department chairman prior to inception of the educational experience.

Second, wherein a supervisor or department chairman had reason to suspect the evaluation or testing instrument(s) by any teacher was inept or biased in degree of objective-accomplishment, the administrator could compel a review of such instrument or elements of instructional process to a three member Review Panel consisting of himself, another teacher in the department selected by said teacher in question, and an agent/representative appointed by the superintendent. This Panel would be empowered, again by original language in the Master Agreement, to mandate changes in either the instructional approach or evaluative tools. If there is ever suspicion as to the competence, allegiance, or integrity of a supervisor or department chairman, the board should take appropriate action.

Educational integrity is further enhanced in a third manner consistent with the original purposes of Evaluative Economics, when the moneys representing less than 100% accomplishment for instructional compensation for any student are redirected for supplementary activities for that student. This could be in the form of personnel specialists, additional programs within the district, or serve as tuition payment for selected activities offered elsewhere.

Finally, the student must not be deprived of the opportunity to maximize his learning, nor the general public disregarded in its increasing desire to justify expenditures in public education. A goal of better teachers exerting their best efforts to educate our children is within reach through a diligent application of the principles and procedures in Evaluative Economics. It is time to begin.

# # #